

regardless of whether she has been convinced by First Affirmative's portrayal of prostitutes as victims rather than criminals.

Role of Second Negative

The role of Second Negative is broadly the same as his opposite number: to put the bulk of argumentation into place to support the Negative case. His rebuttal emphasizes that the studies offered by the Affirmative focus only on very small areas of provincial cities and that Affirmative is proposing adopting legal brothels as a nationwide program. He then adds a new line of attack: He introduces evidence from the cities mentioned that the proposal created a two-tier system of prostitution, one legal and one illegal. Such a system would further marginalize the most vulnerable because prostitutes working outside the brothels would be in danger both from their pimps and the law because of the proposed zero-tolerance policy. This is a classic argument: the proposal being put forward would, indeed, provide a slight improvement in the situation of a majority of those involved but would do so at an intolerable cost to those outside the proposed system. He is now clashing with the Affirmative case by tackling it head on in terms of the personal safety of sex workers. He then goes on to raise the issue of whether simply legalizing criminal activities is a sensible approach to tackling crime and highlights studies that demonstrate that a similar approach with narcotics has had mixed results.

Neither of the examples above is a perfect case on the issue, and the evidence has simply been invented to suit the example, but they serve to illustrate how second speakers can use evidence-based arguments to construct an image in the mind of an adjudicator. In the case of the Affirmative, that image is one of protecting innocent people from serious health problems; in the case of the Negative, it is of the Affirmative's proposal pushing the most vulnerable people further into harm's way, thus exacerbating rather than alleviating the problems associated with prostitution.

ROLE OF SECOND SPEAKER IN THE KARL POPPER FORMAT

As we have seen, in the Karl Popper format, the first speeches present all the arguments for each side. So, the second speeches are considered rebuttal speeches, and it's rebuttal that takes up the bulk of their time. If second speakers need to develop the points made by the first speaker on their side, that's fine, but they can't introduce a new argument at this stage in the debate. Second speakers combine material presented by the first speakers with rebuttal of the other side, synthesizing a complete case to hand on to the final speaker. In short, although all the arguments are presented in the first speeches, the bulk of the "arguing" goes on in the second.